Second-language varieties : Second-language varieties of English

Schreier, Daniel

Spencer, John. 1971. West Africa and the English language: In: John Spencer (ed.), *The English Language in West Africa*, 1–34. London: Longman.
Tillery, J. and G. Bailey. 2004. The urban south: phonology. In: Edgar W. Schneider et al. (eds.), Vol. 1: 325–337.
Torgersen, Eivind and Paul Kerswill. 2004. Internal and external motivation in phonetic change: dialect leveling outcomes for an English vowel shift. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 8(1): 23–53.
Todd, Loreto. 1982. The English language in West Africa. In: Richard W. Bailey and Manfred Görlach (eds.), *English as a World Language*, 281–305. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Upton, Clive. 2004. Received Pronunciation. In: Edgar W. Schneider et al. (eds.), Vol. 1: 217–230.
Van Rooy, Bertus. 2004. Black South African English: Phonology. In: Edgar W. Schneider et al. (eds.), Vol. 1: 943–952.
Wells, John Christopher. 1982. *Accents of English. Vol. 1: Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Wood, Tahir. 1987. *Perceptions of, and attitudes towards, varieties of English in the Cape Peninsula, with particular reference to the 'Coloured Community'*. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.

Rajend Mesthrie, Cape Town (South Africa)

134. Second-Language Varieties: Second-language varieties of English

Abstract

This chapter looks into the formation and function of so-called second-language varieties of English. It discusses the contribution of factors such as social history, population demographics, identity, language use in education, and type of bilingualism to the emergence of these varieties. While it provides examples from English around the world, it concentrates on two varieties in detail, South African English and Hong Kong English. Reference is made to classical models in the field (especially Kachru 1985), more recent work on colony types in general as well as to the role, function, and overall presence of English in the various local sociolinguistic landscapes. Finally, the chapter lists and exemplifies some characteristic features of second-language varieties and draws parallels between their manifestations in distinct settings.

1 Introduction

Over the last decades, the development of English around the world has received a lot interest from linguists in domains as distinct as sociolinguistics, language variation and

Alex Bergs and Laurel Brinton 2012. Historical Linguistics of English (HSK 34.1). de Gruyter. 2106–2120

change, genetic linguistics, typology, etc. Some of the main issues were how to come up with a classification of English as a world language that would account for the spread and diversification of the language and what criteria one would have to select to justify a taxonomy of Englishes. Was this predominantly an extralinguistic decision, so that one should focus on role and function of the language, or was it a linguistic one, i.e., would the new Englishes undergo similar linguistic processes and thus share a set of features? The discussion received a major boost by Braj B. Kachru's (1985, 1986) suggestion that English(es) can be grouped into three largely concentric circles: an *Inner Circle*, i.e. countries of historical continuity which in a sense represent the traditional bases of English (the UK, USA, Australia, etc.), where the language is spoken natively (English as a Native Language, or ENL), all in all with a total number of c.380 million native speakers, the *Outer Circle*, which includes countries where English is important for historical reasons and where it is spoken mostly as a second language (e.g. as the legacy of political expansion or colonization by the British Empire) and where it plays a part in the nation's institutions (English as a Second Language (ESL) countries include India, Nigeria, Pakistan, Kenya, Singapore, etc.; total speaker numbers between 150 to 300 million), and finally the *Expanding Circle*, in which we find those countries where English plays no historical or governmental role but where it is widely used as a foreign language or lingua franca (English as a Foreign Language (EFL) countries include China, Russia, Japan, much of continental Europe, etc.). The total number of English speakers in this circle is most difficult to estimate for obvious reasons (lack of population statistics, degree of proficiency as a guideline, specificity of purposes for using English) but estimates range from 500 million to over one billion (Crystal 1997).

McArthur (1987) and Görlach (1990) developed alternative models, both taking for granted that varieties of English were classified into first- (or native), second- and foreign-speaker groups. Though Kachru's was by far the most influential approach, a number of problems were singled out with all these models, and these have given rise to extensive discussion in the literature (see Mesthrie and Bhatt 2008 for an overview). For one, Kachru's model is static rather than dynamic (not leaving room for transition from one circle to the other), it was based on geography, history, and ancestry rather than on perceptions of identity (e.g. Singapore) or shared linguistic features, and it also failed to account for linguistic diversity within these varieties (e.g., would African American English be a variety of American English – thus inner circle – or should one take into account its origins and language contact history and place it elsewhere, and if so, in which circle?). There were also debates as to whether (and to what extent) the inner circle (UK, USA, New Zealand) should be "norm-providing", meaning norms are developed in these countries since English is a first language, the outer "norm-developing" and the expanding circle "norm-dependent", thus relying on the standards set by native speakers.

The latter point in particular has given rise to a debate and bitter controversy on the role and function of ENL, ESL, and EFL countries, with a strong ideological undercurrent. The most prominent example is certainly the Quirk-Kachru controversy, led publicly in the journal *English Today* in the early 1990s, which started with Quirk's (1990) claim that there were parallels between non-native and non-standard varieties of English and that both needed access to a (native) standard variety:

> […] no one should underestimate the problem of teaching English in such countries as India or Nigeria, where the English of the teachers themselves inevitably bears the

> stamp of *locally acquired deviation from the standard language* ('You are knowing my father, isn't it?') … It is neither liberal nor liberating to permit learners to settle for lower standards than the best. (Quirk 1990: 8–9; my emphasis).

Consequently, ESL varieties of English (Indian or Nigerian English) were considered as norm-dependent on British English and native varieties were assumed to hold a given advantage over non-native ones, which were considered as little more than deficit deviations of the norm, just like vernacular varieties of inner-circle varieties. These (in my opinion misguided) views were even embraced by sociolinguists, such as Trudgill (2002: 151), who claimed that "[t]he *true repository of the English language is its native speakers*, and there are so many of them that they can afford to let non-natives do what they like with it so long as what they do is *confined to a few words here and there*" (my emphasis), which was criticized extensively and considered as condescending or derogatory, particularly since Trudgill failed to set out what L1 competence was in the first place and what differentiated it from ESL or EFL competence. Extremist "pro-native speaker" views *à la* Quirk and Trudgill have seen intense debates on the linguistic competence of speakers (both of monolingual and bilingual ones) and issued a general controversy as to what it takes to be classified as a "native speaker" in the first place (which, by the way, some would deny as a valid concept altogether, as evidenced by Paikeday's [1985: 14] equally extremist claim that "the native speaker is dead") or what sets native speakers apart from second- or foreign speakers of the language (see discussion in Seidlhofer 2005).

Leaving the thorny question of competence aside, the real question is probably whether the *usage* of English around the world is a promising criterion for classification or not. This is by no means easy to answer since a number of factors are involved: non-linguistic ones such as social history, population demographics, or educational politics, sociological ones such as identity construction and access to power and education, psychological and psycholinguistic ones such as language acquisition and learning, and sociolinguistic ones such as societal bilingualism and diglossia. Indeed, it would seem that any model of English as a global language would to some extent have to integrate these factors, which makes it such a difficult task and leaves any effort open to criticism of some sort. In the remainder of the chapter, then, I focus on the interplay of some these issues and the consequences that arise thereof, particularly for the classification of English(es) in a coherent model using labels such as ENL, ESL and EFL. I will explore this further by tracing the development of English in two proto-typical, well-researched ESL countries (of South Africa and Hong Kong) and then reaching some tentative conclusions.

2 ESL development: the common denominator

The role and function of English around the world hinges on historical, social, and linguistic criteria. A first point to consider is which of them matters most, i.e. whether the assignment of ESL status should be made with reference to one particular factor. Social history is an often-cited criterion, also for the impact of colony type (plantation vs. exploitation, e.g. in Africa or in the Caribbean) and the relationship between ESL varieties and the formation of contact varieties (pidgins and creoles; cf. Mufwene 2001; Romaine, Chapter 113). ESL countries have a historical, often colonial or post-colonial,

relationship with Great Britain or the USA (i.e., with classical "inner-circle" varieties). Very often, the exportation of the English language originated in political expansionism and commerce when trade contacts were established in Africa and India from the early 1600s onwards. As a consequence, the language gained a foothold via the administration of the developing colonies, first used among the expatriate community and then as a lingua franca with the local population when the infrastructure was built up and trade patterns intensified. English was first spoken in bridgeheads along the coast (often ports, such as Surat, Madras, and Bombay in India or Fort Cormantine in Ghana), from where it diffused into the neighboring areas and became subsequently used by the communities in contact (as a lingua franca). English was present in everyday life since a part of the community consisted of native speakers of British or American English (clergy, clerks, teachers, missionaries, etc.). This meant that population demographics is an important criterion as well, since the English-speaking group represented a minority and English was one language amongst many, spoken by a newcomer community that almost exclusively developed economic interests. At a later stage, this changed due to social and political developments. English became the major medium in political discourse, education, and administration and was often maintained for these purposes when the former colonies (in Africa, Asia, or in the Caribbean) gained independence. This meant that English was used for all official correspondence, for advertisement and in literature. Today, the role of English in administration and education is paramount in ESL countries such as Kenya, Sri Lanka, or Nigeria. Often, it was by no means uncontroversial whether one should keep the language of the former colonizing power for official purposes or opt for a local one instead (this is expressed in the writing of Derek Walcott, St Lucian Nobel Laureate for Literature: "It's good that everything's gone, except their language, which is everything" in his poem *North and South*). Conflicts of this kind are typically at the root of ideological issues behind language choice in post-colonial settings. They go hand in hand with the construction of identity; does the community orient itself towards the "mother country" and its values and standards or does it focus on itself and strive towards the development of independent norms? In fact, identity has been singled out by Schneider (2007) as the single most important factor in the evolution of Englishes around the world.

In addition, English was often enshrined in the educational tier as well and secondary and tertiary education was offered in English only. The advantages for education are obvious (access to a world language, historical legacy, availability of teaching materials, international audience, and readership, higher chances of placing publications in scientific journals, etc.), but the disadvantages are, again, that ideological issues are often not resolved and that not all sections of the population have equal access to and competence of English (in India, for instance, one of the most influential ESL countries, English is still spoken by a minority of the populace only, Hindi being more widespread (see Sharma, Chapter 132).

Another cornerstone of ESL development is *societal bilingualism* (and one of its sociolinguistic correlates, *diglossia*). Here a difference is typically made between the (indigenous) home language and the language used for official purposes and administration. The addition of languages changes the societal equilibrium of language usage and typically entails that one language is considered more prestigious and beneficial for economic welfare and advancement, even to the extent that such an imbalance fosters social inequality. Consequently, ESL often features in a context of additive

bilingualism, which is the addition of a language to the sociolinguistic repertoire of a speech community and the functional specialization of the varieties used that results from this. Conversely, the exportation of English may lead to subtractive bilingualism, i.e., the gradual disappearance of other languages via shift or death. Typically, though, ESL operates in stable conditions, used within a set number of domains in official usage (administration, education, media, etc.). Taking all these criteria into account, it is striking to find that ESL conditions resemble the conditioning factors of the so-called "New Englishes", a term introduced by Platt et al. (1984), in that they share the following characteristics:

(1) development via a local education system, not primarily as a home language;
(2) adoption of the language in an environment where English is spoken natively by a minority of the population only;
(3) usage for a range of functions and skills (letter writing, administration, literature, advertisement, etc.) and
(4) indigenization, the development of distinctive local features (cf. also Schneider 2007).

The bottom line is that the discussion of ESL development has a strong ideological component (particularly in the debate of native vs. non-native speakers) and its definition has traditionally drawn on criteria by nature sociological, educational, or historical. It is only much more recently that the question has been approached from a more linguistic point of view. As Sand (2004) suggests, if history, identity, sociodemographics or the combination of all these factors poses problems for definition, maybe it is beneficial to look into shared structural features and classify ESL varieties along such principles.

3 Linguistic features of ESL varieties

A linguistic analysis of ESLs centers on the question whether linguistic features are shared or not and the factors that can be offered to account for resemblances between the varieties (substratum effects, interference, founder effects, etc.). Whereas the first is mostly a descriptive task, the second involves more general issues in linguistic theory, e.g. contact-induced change, universals, language learning and interlanguage development. In the following, I list a representative selection of prominent and widespread features, providing examples from the literature for each case (examples come from Schneider 2007 and Mesthrie and Bhatt 2008, unless specified otherwise).

First of all, the definite article is variably absent or substituted by *one*, often within the same variety, as in (1a, b).

(1) a. *I want to buy Ø bag.* (Singapore English [SgpE])
b. *Here got one stall selling soup noodles.* (SgpE)

There is a tendency to conflate demonstratives *this* and *these*, and singular forms are commonly used with plural reference ("this worms, they get into your body" in Native American English [NatAmE]), as in (2). *It* can occur in this context as well.

(2) *Those books are very informative. It can be obtained at Dillons.* (Malaysian English [MalE])

Mass nouns often undergo plural *-s* suffixation and are treated as count nouns. Many varieties of African or Asian English have plural forms such as *staffs, furnitures, fruits, equipments*, etc. This is reported in NatAmE as well (*alphabets, homeworks*, etc.; Leap 1993: 54).

Personal pronouns may be absent, as in (3).

(3) *Ø must buy for him; otherwise he not happy.* (SgpE)

Existential *it* is absent so that a copula form is used for the existential construction, as in (4a, b):

(4) a. *But when I move into the flat, is OK.* (Philippine English)
b. *Here is not allowed to stop the car.* (Hong Kong English [HKE])

Alternatively, one finds *get* in existentials as a substitute, as in (5a, b):

(5) a. *Here got very many people.* (SgpE)
b. *Got one ghost over there.* (Black South African English [SAfrE])

As for the verb phrase, the past tense suffix *-ed* is absent, so that past tense is not overtly marked, as in (6).

(6) *We stayØ there whole afternoon and we catch one small fish.* (SgpE)

Present tense *-s* suffixation is typically reduced and sentences such as "she singØ very well" are reported in nearly every ESL variety.

Copula forms of *be* are commonly absent, as in (7).

(7) *The house Ø very nice.* (SgpE)

In the case of irregular verbs, sometimes the bare root (or infinitival form) is used instead of the preterit or past participle form, as in (8a, b).

(8) a. *Last time she come on Thursday.* (SgpE)
b. *He already go home.* (MalE)

Past tense reference is then very often denoted by an (unstressed) *did* before the main verb, as in (9a, b):

(9) a. *She did take the book.* (Swaziland English)
b. *I did go to town yesterday.* (East African English [EAfrE])

ESL varieties also have a tendency for *have +ed* to refer to punctual and/or completed events, as in (10a, b).

(10) a. *I have read this book last month.* (Indian English [IndE])
b. *It has been established many years ago.* (Ghanaian English [GhanE])

Futurity is often expressed without a preverbal marker *will* or *shall*, so that present tense expresses future reference as well.

As for modality, *will* is often used instead of *would*; sentences such as the following are reported from Black SAfrE, Nigerian English, GhanE, Indian SAfrE and MalE, as in (11a, b):

(11) a. *I will like to go right now.*
b. *I will like to see him.* (both from GhanE)

The extension of progressives is characteristic as well. StdE makes a distinction between progressives according to verb type (non-stative verbs that denote actions, e.g. *hike, dream, buy*, can take an *-ing* progressive whereas stative ones, *smell, know, like*, etc., can't). ESL varieties typically allow progressives with both verb types, so that we find examples as in (12a–c):

(12) a. *I am having a cold.* (SgpE)
b. *I am smelling something.* (NigE)
c. *She is owning two luxury apartments.* (MalE)

There is also creativity and flexibility in what regards transfer of part of speech and compound verbs. *On* and *off* are used as verbs in Indian SAfrE or MalE (with the meaning of 'to switch on/off'), as in (13):

(13) *I told her to on the stove but she offed it.* (Indian SAfrE)

There is also considerable creativity in morphological conversion and word-formation. New compound verbs include "by-heart v." ('to learn sth. by heart') or "back-answer v." ('to answer back, to reply'), as in (14a–c):

Morphological conversion and word-formation:

(14) a. *She was by-hearting her work.* (IndE)
b. *He's always back-answering me.* (Indian SAfrE)
c. *He look-aftered his children very well.* (Indian SAfrE)

Finally, there also is variation in the usage of prepositions. *Of* may be used where StdE would have *by*, for instance (15):

(15) *He got fired of the church.* (Native AmE)

Alternatively, prepositions may be absent, as in (16a–c):

(16) a. *He lives that second house.*
b. *You wanna go bathroom?*
c. *They live New York.* (all NatAmE)

Mesthrie (1987) reports what he refers to as "quasi-postpositions" in basilectal Indian SAfrE: *night-time* 'at night', *Telugu way* 'in Telugu'; *Fountain Head side* 'towards Fountain Head'; *morning part* 'in the morning'.

To sum up, it has been suggested that ESL varieties share a set of common properties in phonology, morphosyntax, lexicon, and language usage (Kasper 1992). According to Platt et al. (1984), Sand (2004), and Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008), these include the following features:

- in *phonetics* and *phonology*: monophthongs instead of diphthongs in FACE and GOAT; reduction, perhaps even loss, of length-quality contrasts as a result of phonological mergers (e.g. *ship-sheep, full-fool*); TH-stopping (dental fricatives being realized as plosives /t, d/); a strong tendency to reduce consonant clusters via deletion of the last consonant (Schreier 2005); stress changes in polysyllabic words (*dedicáted, finánce*); and syllable-timing
- in *morphosyntax*: various processes of morphological and/or syntactic regularization: loss of third-person singular *-s*, past tense *-ed* or copula verbs; extension of the progressive; overuse of the present perfect; idiomatic use of prepositions and article use; reclassification of count-nouns as non-count ones and vice versa (as evidenced by pluralization); alternative fronting or focus constructions
- in general *usage* and *pragmatics*: register clashes, excessive formality, invariant tags: *no?, isn't it?, is it?, true?, true or not?*; differential conversational routines or turn-taking strategies:

  A: *Hi, just come ah.*
  B: *So o.k. lah.* (SingE)

  A: *Hasn't the President left yet?*
  B: *Yes, he hasn't.* (SingE, EAfrE)

  A: *Would you like to come to my house for dinner on Tuesday?*
  B: *I don't mind.* (SingE, MalE)
  (examples from Platt et al. 1984: 158–159).

Whereas it is not contested that these features make an appearance in ESL varieties, it is debated as to whether (and if yes, to what extent) they are diagnostic. It has been pointed out that nearly all of them make an appearance elsewhere too. In pidgin and creole linguistics, for instance, feature lists of this kind have enjoyed particular popularity, to name but Bickerton's twelve feature list (Bickerton 1981). An analysis of the *Handbook of Varieties of English* (Schneider et al. 2004) shows that these features make an appearance in varieties around the world and that they show up regardless of whether the variety has ENL, ESL, or EFL status. Copula absence (*she Ø nice person*) or reduced tense or person affixation (*they walkØ out on me las' night*) are extremely common in English-derived pidgins and creoles as well, for instance, and FACE and GOAT monophthongs manifest themselves in ENL varieties of British English (e.g. in Scotland or the English South West), to give but two examples. Whereas some features are certainly diagnostic for a single variety (for example the discourse particles *mah, leh* or *lor* in SgpE), there is probably no single feature that characterizes the class of ESL varieties exclusively, i.e. that is found in all ESL varieties and not in others. Consequently, linguistic features are helpful for analyzing the development and origins of ESLs (substratal effects, transfer) but they are not a reliable criterion for the assignment of language

status, simply on account of the fact that these features make an appearance in EFL or ENL varieties, pidgins and creoles, etc., also.

An important study in this context is Sand (2004). Based on data from the *International Corpus of English* (ICE), she analyzed article use (both definite and indefinite ones) in a variety of Englishes: ENL (Great Britain, New Zealand) and ESL (India, Singapore, and Kenya). She found some differences between ENL and ESL varieties (as exemplified above) but considerable variation in all three ESL varieties also, irrespective of the local substrates and contact scenarios, which ruled substratum influence out as a determining factor in their development. Rather, the most important factor to condition variability was text type and style. In spoken text types, articles were used least often in informal contexts and spontaneous conversations, and most often in formal settings such as public speech or lectures. This led her to conclude that variation in article usage in ESL varieties such as IndE, SgpE and KenyE "must be chiefly due to individual speakers' or writers' level of competence or stylistic preference" (Sand 2004: 294).

4 Two cases in point: South Africa and Hong Kong

According to McArthur, the list of ESL countries includes (in alphabetical order)

> Bangladesh, Botswana, Brunei, Cameroon, Cook Islands, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Hong Kong, India, Kenya, Kiribati, Lesotho, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Puerto Rico, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Tanzania, Tuvalu, Uganda, Vanuatu, Western Samoa, Zambia, Zimbabwe. (McArthur 1992: 353)

Whereas this is by no means the definite list of all ESL varieties (South Africa is missing, for instance, and there are countries such as Papua New Guinea, Tanzania or the Seychelles where such a claim would in all likelihood not meet general approval), it is clear that we are dealing with a rather heterogeneous group of varieties. They all developed under different circumstances and in distinct settings (at different periods of time, in varying sociodemographic conditions, in distinctive sociolinguistic scenarios, etc.), and such heterogeneity and complexity of ESL development accounts for the fact that neither sociohistorical nor linguistic criteria can be advanced for their classification as an exclusive category. I would like to conclude this chapter by concentrating on two ESL varieties that have been subject to extensive research, South Africa and Hong Kong, by means of an illustration of how they develop and in what context(s) they are used.

South Africa has a rich settlement history and archaeologists have uncovered human settlements that are approximately three million years old (Thompson 2001). European involvement started some five centuries ago, when navigators explored and developed the East Indies trade routes. The first European navigator to circumnavigate the Cape was the Portuguese explorer Bartolomeu Dias in 1488 and until the late 1600s, the Portuguese set up small fishing settlements and trade forts along the coast, without making efforts toward colonization, however. This changed in 1652, when the Dutch East India Company established a permanent residence in Cape Town. Jan van Riebeeck established a station and fort and formally declared Table Bay a Dutch possession. Indentured laborers and slaves were soon brought from Indonesia, Madagascar, and India, and this group of slaves merged into the so-called "Cape Malays". The local populace

was joined by Huguenots and Germans who arrived in considerable numbers from the late 17th century onwards, merging with the Dutch to form the population group soon referred to as "Boers" or "Afrikaners". In 1795, the British began their military presence at the Cape. They seized the Cape of Good Hope area in 1797 and established permanent residence. When the Dutch East India Company declared bankruptcy, Great Britain formally annexed the Cape Colony in 1805. At first a politics of limited settlement was pursued but this changed in the 1820s: the local infrastructure was built up and new settlers and soldiers arrived (Ross and Anderson 1999). As a result, the Boers migrated to the interior and thousands of families left between 1835 and 1848 (the "Trekker" movement), their primary motivation being the escape from British rule (Worden 2000). The discovery of diamonds in 1867 and gold in 1886 encouraged economic growth and led to a further expansion of the British Empire which culminated in the two Boer Wars (Pakenham 1979). The first one (1880–1881) was won by the Boers, the second one (1899–1902) by the British. As a result, the Union of South Africa (a dominion) was created in 1910 from the former Cape and Natal colonies, the republics of Orange Free State and the Transvaal. In 1934, the South African Party and National Party merged to form the United Party, seeking reconciliation between Afrikaners and English-speaking Whites, but split up in 1939 over the question whether or not to enter World War II. This paved the way for the National Party. In 1948, it was elected to power and began implementing a series of segregationist laws collectively known as apartheid, which lasted until 1990 (Beinart 2001). The end of the 20th and the early 21st centuries saw the implementation of democracy and an opening of the country.

The language situation is as follows. South Africa currently has a total of 11 official languages (second in number only to the 23 national languages of India): Afrikaans, English, Ndebele, Northern Sotho, Southern Sotho, Swati, Tsonga, Tswana, Venda, Xhosa, and Zulu. Two are Indo-European, English and Afrikaans, while the other nine are languages of the Bantu family (of Africa's largest phylum, the Niger-Congo languages). Furthermore, South Africa recognizes eight non-official languages as "national languages" (among them Fanagalo, an unusual contact-derived variety with Zulu as a major lexifier, and South African Sign Language). According to the 1996 National Census, the four most frequently used home (or first) languages are: Zulu (9.8 million), Xhosa (7.5 million), Afrikaans (6.9 million) and English (5.7 million). The three most spoken second home languages are: English (2.2 million), Afrikaans (1.1 million) and Zulu (0.5 million). This illustrates the social significance of English; though it is not among the top three first languages, it is by far the most widely spoken second language in South Africa, and it is the language of government, trade, and commerce as well (Mesthrie 2002). The settler populations that derive from the European settlers speak either English or Afrikaans, whereas a substantial segment of the indigenous population has ESL. One concludes that there is a range of varieties of English, not only as first or second ones but also in each of these categories. According to Lanham (1985), there are at least three varieties of White SAfrE: "conservative" SAfrE which strongly resembles British Received Pronunciation (RP) and is an expression of cultural ties to Britain; "respectable" SAfrE, which goes back to the urban middle classes of 19th century Natal, and "extreme" SAfrE, formed and spoken by early 19th century cape settlers, the urban working class (characterized by "masculinity, independence, physical toughness, a disdain for proprieties, and a commitment to the typically SA [South African] identity", Lanham 1985: 245–246),

and White SAfrE has given to more recent research (Bowerman 2004). English is also spoken by other ethnic groups, Indian, blacks, Cape Coloreds, most of whom speak it as a second language alongside their native language (Zulu, Xhosa, Hindi, etc.).

Hong Kong provides an altogether different scenario of ESL development. The islands have a total population of 8 million and the two most populated islands, Kowloon and Hong Kong Island (88km^2 of a total of 1,046km^2), are among the most densely populated areas in the world. The presence of English in this part of the world is fairly recent. Although Hong Kong was of utmost strategic and commercial importance, there was nothing more than a small Chinese fishing population until the mid-19th century (Buckley 1997). Only in 1841 did British merchants start using the harbor for opium trade. Following the first Opium War between Britain and China (1839–1842), China ceded Hong Kong Island to Britain and Kowloon came under English authority after the second 1856–1860 Opium War (when Britain and France united against China). The territory was extended further and in 1898, the so-called "New Territories" were leased to Britain for 99 years. The harbor was used for free trade in South Asia and Hong Kong saw a massive influx of immigrants following the Chinese Revolution (1912), the Sino-Japanese War (1937) and during World War II.

When the British lease expired in 1997, the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region was established. The Chinese government pursued a "one country, two systems" policy. On the one hand, the Chinese central government subsumed direct control of the territory but granted at the same time a (comparatively) high degree of political autonomy (except for foreign policy and defence). A western-oriented capitalist economy was maintained, also due to the fact that Hong Kong had limited natural resources, thus being very much dependent on imports for almost all requirements (including raw materials, water, food, consumer and capital goods, petrol and the like; Buckley 1997). It was given unique status as international free port (there were no import taxes, for instance) and to the present day keeps its prominent role in trade, shipping, and freight forwarding, in manufacturing and light industries, as an international financial center. All in all, it is estimated that the service sector earns c.80% of the gross domestic product. The economic success of Hong Kong depends on trade, commerce, and financial services, which means that international communication is extremely important and that English must be used and maintained to fulfil such purposes (Bolton 2003).

The language situation reflects the sociodemographic set-up of the community. Ninety five per cent of the total population are Chinese, though mostly born in Hong Kong, 4.2% are from other Asian countries, and only about 0.5% are from Europe, the USA or Australasia (Great Britain, United States, Canada, Australia, or New Zealand, thus "inner-circle" countries), the remaining 0.3% from elsewhere. During the British administration, the only official language was English; since 1997, English and Chinese share that function. Mandarin is one of the main written Chinese varieties locally and it has been gaining in importance since the reintegration with China. It has the status of a standard language and is used for most official purposes (Pennington 1998). Cantonese is the common and most widely used language in the public, it is understood almost universally and the main spoken variety. In contrast, only about 25% of the population understands some English and there is a wide range in terms of proficiency. English is the main language of business correspondence and social advancement and essential for all higher paid positions in larger firms, including secretaries. Chinese with little education on occasion use English as a lingua franca but Cantonese is the common

and most widely used language in shops and markets. Code mixing is common (Bolton 2003) but using English within the Hong Kong Chinese community is valued negatively. As for education, there is a choice between English or Chinese, the other language being taught as a foreign language, and the most common curriculum involves Chinese at primary and English at secondary school. The language of media and entertainment is predominantly Chinese, but English is used also. By and large then, English and Chinese have undergone refunctionalization. Both have official status and are used in education, but Hong Kong English is very much the language of power and international communication, whereas (Cantonese) Chinese is the language of solidarity and a symbol of ethnicity in the local community.

To sum up, the most important criteria in ESL domains relate to social history, population demographics, identity, language use in education, and type of bilingualism. There exist similarities between these two ESL countries but there are also some considerable differences as well. The differences concern the timing of English and the major thrust of settlement (South Africa in the early 1800s, Hong Kong in the second half of the 19th century), the sociolinguistic environment into which English was embedded, local migration patterns and population movements as well as the presence of and contact with other European languages and the degree of societal bilingualism. The similarities between South Africa and Hong Kong are such that a community of speakers of British English have at all times been in the minority; the majority of the population, in contrast, never spoke English as a home language. Moreover, the role and function of English is restricted to commerce, trade, politics and public discourse, and it is typically taught as the first foreign language in the curriculum.

5 Summary

The concept of ESL countries is well-established in the literature by now. It overlaps with Kachru's outer circle and integrates a number of historical and sociolinguistic criteria. Notwithstanding, the concept remains problematic for several reasons. Leaving aside the ideological debate surrounding norm-providing authorities and native vs. non-native competence (ESL being no more than a deviation of ENL norms, as Trudgill [2002] and Quirk [1990] claim), these differences include the delimitation of ESL *vis-à-vis* other functions of English around the world, the stability of ESL countries and the linguistic development they undergo. First of all, the historical account of South Africa has made it clear that it should be classified as an ESL country since the majority of the population (black, colored, and white) speak English as a second and Zulu, Xhosa, or Afrikaans as a first language. This has not always been the case, since, during Apartheid, the ethnic groups were segregated as much as possible following the National Party's active policy to bar access to English for blacks. Indeed, the riots were caused by the government's decision to make Afrikaans the medium of instruction instead of English. In the words of Mesthrie and Bhatt,

> [a]lthough ESL was the general outcome of language contact in South Africa, it is a moot question whether in some parts of the country English was till recently virtually a foreign language […] Should we then change our definitions to allow ESL to operate even in EFL territories (to describe the competence of, say, a few speakers who have been to an English-speaking country) and to allow EFL pockets in an ESL territory? (Mesthrie and Bhatt 2008: 8)

The case of South Africa is exemplary; it would be misguided to assume that English serves as a second language in all sections of the total population. In contrast, there are ENL speakers (though in a minority) and also ESL speakers and a sizeable group (usually those without access to education) who do not speak English at all. Labels such as ESL or EFL thus suggest conformity and homogeneity that in reality does not exist. A second question mark concerns social demographics and integration. For instance, it is not clear at all how high the total percentage of a group of BrE speakers must be in the total population so that we can speak of an ESL variety. Is there a cut-off point and a critical mass or alternatively, should one not with benefit look at social integration? Community workers, for instance, are much more "on the ground" and engaged in face-to-face interaction (and thus likely to spread English via direct communication) than high-court judges, chief administrators or governors, and this would enhance the usage of English considerably. One would thus certainly benefit from filtering in sociolinguistic information on the regional-specific contexts of language usage and the social relationships between individual speakers and adopt a more micro-oriented perspective.

Last but not least, the distinction between inner, outer, and expanding circles transition, ENL, ESL, and EFL is by no means rigid and boundaries are (indeed have been) fuzzy at all times. To give but one example: Irish English formed in a context of language contact and bilingualism, which led to language shift and the endangerment of Irish, so at one stage it must have met all the criteria to be classified as an ESL variety. Today, however, it ranks among the "inner-circle" varieties (Hickey 2004). Scandinavia or the Netherlands may well be in the process of shifting from EFL to ESL countries since they changed their educational policies (Preisler 2003; Phillipson 1992). A similar process may occur on a non-national level in Switzerland. Each of the 26 cantons is in charge of its curriculum and several cantons (among them Zurich and Appenzell Ausserrhoden) have recently opted for English as a first foreign language at school, at the expense of French. This decision has given rise to bitter debates since French is one of the national languages of Switzerland. The case of "*Frühenglisch*" in Switzerland thus provides an extreme case of ESL vs. EFL, with some cantons favoring ESL policies in education and others EFL, and it remains to be seen what this means for the function of English as a lingua franca in Switzerland.

An opposite scenario is found as well. A government may opt to leave the circles and thwart the role of English altogether. The case of Tanzania is a well-known example. English was the language of colonial administration during the era of British rule, a situation very much akin to Kenya (see Sections 2 and 4 above). After gaining independence, Tanzania opted for Swahili for all public and administrative functions so that English is now no longer used in administration, parliament or for government and public discourse. Though no language is *de jure* official, Swahili is the *de facto* official national language, used for inter-ethnic communication and all official matters. Consequently, Tanzania is one of the few African states in which a local language gained importance to the disadvantage of the ex-colonial language. English has not vanished altogether, however; according to the official linguistic policy of Tanzania, as announced in 1984, Swahili is the language of the social and political sphere as well as primary and adult education, whereas English is used in secondary education, universities, technology, and higher courts. Though the British government financially supports the use of English in Tanzania, its usage in the Tanzanian society has diminished over the past decades. According to McArthur (1992), Tanzanian university students in the 70s used to

speak English with each other on a regular basis whereas now they almost exclusively use Swahili outside the classroom. As a result, Tanzanian English has a rather special status among the varieties of English around the world.

I conclude that ESL status is determined by a number of factors, such as minority of settlers from "inner-circle" countries, the official usage of English in administration and education and historical legacy of British (post-)colonialism. At the same token, there is considerable variability within the territories classified as ESL countries, for political, sociolinguistic, sociopsychological and historical reasons, which stands in the way of delimiting them as a homogeneous category as opposed to ENL or EFL varieties.

6 References

Beinart, William. 2001. *Twentieth-Century South Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bickerton, Derek. 1981. *Roots of Language*. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma Publishers.

Bolton, Kingsley. 2003. *Chinese Englishes. A Sociolinguistic History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bowerman, Sean. 2004. White South African English: Phonology. In: Edgar W. Schneider et al. (eds.), 931–942.

Buckley, Roger. 1997. *Hong Kong: The Road to 1997*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, David. 1997. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Görlach, Manfred. 1990. *Studies in the History of the English Language*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Hickey, Raymond. 2004. Development and diffusion of Irish English. In: Raymond Hickey (ed.), *Legacies of Colonial English*, 82–120. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, Braj B. 1985. Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the Outer Circle. In: Randolph Quirk and Henry Widdowson (eds.), *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literature*, 11–30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, Braj B. 1986. *The Alchemy of English. The Spread, Functions and Models of Non-native English*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kasper, Gabriele. 1992. Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research* 8: 203–231.

Lanham, Leonard W. 1985. The perception and evaluation of varieties of English in South African society. In: Sidney Greenbaum (ed.), *The English Language today*, 242–251. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Leap, William. 1993. *American Indian English*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

McArthur, Tom. 1987. The English languages? *English Today* 11: 9–11.

McArthur, Tom (ed.). 1992. *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Mesthrie, Rajend. 1987. From OV to VO in language shift: South African Indian English and its OV substrates. *English World-Wide* 8: 263–276.

Mesthrie, Rajend (ed.). 2002. *Language in South Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mesthrie, Rajend and Rakesh M. Bhatt. 2008. *World Englishes: The Study of New Linguistic Variables*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2001. *The Ecology of Language Evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Paikeday, Thomas M. 1985. *The Native Speaker is Dead* ! Toronto/New York: Paikeday Publishing Inc.

Pakenham, Thomas. 1979. *The Boer War*. New York: Random House.

Pennington, Martha C. (ed.). 1998. *Language in Hong Kong at Century's End*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Phillipson, Robert. 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Platt, John, Heidi Weber and Mian Lian Ho. 1984. *The New Englishes*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Preisler, Bent. 2003. English in Danish and the Danes' English. In: Tore Kristiansen and Normann Jørgensen (eds.), *The Sociolinguistics of Denmark and Danish*, 109–126. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Quirk, Randolph. 1990. Language varieties and standard language. *English Today* 21: 3–10.
Ross, Robert and David Anderson. 1999. *Status and Respectability in the Cape Colony, 1750–1870: A Tragedy of Manners.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sand, Andrea. 2004. Shared morpho-syntactic in contact-derived varieties of English: Article use. *World Englishes* 23: 281–298.
Schneider, Edgar W. 2007. *Postcolonial Englishes.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Schneider, Edgar W., Kate Burridge, Bernd Kortmann, Rajend Mesthrie, and Clive Upton, (eds.) 2004. *Handbook of Varieties of English*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Schreier, Daniel. 2005. *Consonant Change in English Worldwide: Synchrony meets Diachrony.* Basingstoke/ New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2005. Language variation and change: the case of English as lingua franca. In: Katarzyna Dziubalska-Kolaczyk and Joanna Przedlacka (eds.), *English Pronunciation Models: A Changing Scene*, 59–75. Bern: Peter Lang.
Thompson, Leonard. 2001. *A History of South Africa*. 3rd edn. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Trudgill, Peter. 2002. *Sociolinguistic Variation and Change.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Worden, Nigel. 2000. *Making of modern South Africa: Conquest, Segregation and Apartheid*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Daniel Schreier, Zürich (Switzerland)

135. Second-Language Varieties: English-based creoles

Abstract

Most English-based creoles developed in colonial settings and are therefore linked to the age of British colonial expansion from the 17th to the 19th century. In the following survey, all English-based creoles will be listed, but special attention will be given to three typical representatives of different types of English-based creoles in the form of three case studies. This is followed by a brief discussion of the most characteristic phonological and morpho-syntactic features shared by a large number of creoles.

1 English-based creoles: a survey

Due to their regional distribution, historical background, and linguistic features, the English-based Creoles are divided into two major groups, the Atlantic Creoles spoken in the Caribbean, North and Central America, and West Africa, and the Pacific Creoles, spoken in Australia and various islands and archipelagos in the Pacific.

Alex Bergs and Laurel Brinton 2012. Historical Linguistics of English (HSK 34.1). de Gruyter. 2120–2134